

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 97-7320**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

STEVEN A. SILVERS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Herbert N. Maletz, Senior Judge, sitting by designation. (CR-87-144-Y)

---

Submitted: December 11, 1997

Decided: January 28, 1998

---

Before HALL and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges, and PHILLIPS, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Steven A. Silvers, Appellant Pro Se. Richard Charles Kay, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Steven A. Silvers appeals the district court's denial of his motion filed under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e), in which Silvers sought reconsideration of the district court's previous denial of his motion filed under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). We review the denial of a Rule 59(e) motion for abuse of discretion. See Collision v. International Chem. Workers Union, 34 F.3d 233, 236 (4th Cir. 1994). The underlying goal of Silvers' motions is to have certain real property returned to him, which he contends was improperly forfeited in conjunction with his previous criminal prosecution. Because Silvers has already filed a motion for return of property, which was denied by the district court, and the denial affirmed by this court, United States v. Silvers, No. 96-7386 (4th Cir. Jan. 28, 1997) (unpublished), and Silvers has not raised any meritorious issues nor presented to the district court any evidence not previously considered by either the district court or this court as to the return of his property, we find that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Silvers' Rule 59(e) motion.\*

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's denial of Silvers' Rule 59(e) motion. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the Court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

---

\* Silvers has submitted evidence to this court which he has not first presented to the district court. Because this is not the proper forum for presenting new evidence, we decline to consider Silvers' filing.

AFFIRMED